REMARKS

The statement by the Examiner that claims 2 and 3 contain allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 1-4 are pending in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohmae, U.S. Patent no. 5,237,698. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a power supply system for supplying power to a CPU. The system comprises, among other things, "a voltage detecting circuit for outputting a reset signal for resetting the CPU when the supply voltage is at or below a prescribed voltage detection value; [and] a control circuit for decreasing the supply voltage to a prescribed power save voltage level when a power saving mode is set." According to claim 1, the "control circuit decreases the supply voltage to be the prescribed power save voltage level after decreasing the prescribed voltage detection value to be less than or equal to the power save voltage level when the power saving mode is set such that the reset signal is not output when the power saving mode is being set" (emphasis added). Moreover, the "control circuit recovers the prescribed voltage detection value after recovering the supply voltage when the power saving mode is terminated." Applicant respectfully submits that Ohmae fails to disclose the claimed invention.

Specifically, the cited portions of Ohmae merely disclose that a supply voltage may be reduced and thus used as a power saving mode voltage level. In Ohmae, the reduced supply voltage is used when the CPU enters the standby mode.

Applicant respectfully submits that this is a standard/conventional means of setting power in a standby mode and is not what claim 1 recites.

Instead, claim 1 recites that the control circuit "decreases the supply voltage to be the prescribed power save voltage level after decreasing the prescribed voltage detection value to be less than or equal to the power save voltage level when the power saving mode is set such that the reset signal is not output when the power saving mode is being set." Specifically, the claimed invention does not generate a reset signal during the setting of the power saving mode. This is accomplished by decreasing the detection voltage level so the voltage detecting circuit does not determine that a reset voltage must be output. To do so, the control circuit must lower the detection voltage level before lowering the supply voltage level to the power saving mode level. Otherwise, the voltage detecting circuit would generate and output the reset signal when it is not desirable to do so. These operations are simply not found in Ohmae.

Moreover, because Ohmae fails to lower the voltage detection level, Ohmae must also fail to disclose recovering "the prescribed voltage detection value after recovering the supply voltage when the power saving mode is terminated." This is one more reason why claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 4 similarly recites a method for supplying power to a CPU providing a power saving mode. The method comprising the steps of "providing a reset signal for resetting the CPU when an output voltage from a power supply is less than or equal to a prescribed operable level; setting a power saving mode; decreasing the prescribed operable level before decreasing the output voltage down to a power saving level such that the reset signal is not provided when setting the power saving mode; resetting the power saving mode; and recovering the prescribed operable level after recovering the output voltage."

As set forth above, Ohmae fails to disclose "decreasing the prescribed operable level before decreasing the output voltage down to a power saving level such that the reset signal is not provided when setting the power saving mode" and "recovering the prescribed operable level after recovering the output voltage ." Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 and 3 are allowable if they were drafted as independent claims including the limitations of their base claims.[1] Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. Applicant believes that claim 1 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3 are in condition for allowance and that any objection to these claims be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Thomas J. D'Amico
Registration No.: 28,371
Gianni Minutoli
Registration No.: 41,198
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant

[1] The Office Action also refers to overcoming 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections, but the 112 rejections were overcome in the prior Amendment and no such rejections were made in the present Office Action.